	S DISTRICT COURT T OF MINNESOTA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) CRIMINAL ACTION) NO. 02-127 (ADM/AJB))
VS.)
(1) THOMAS JAMES MARTIN) Courtroom 13 West) Thursday, March 19, 2009) Minneapolis, Minnesota

HEARING ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR EXEMPTION

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANN D. MONTGOMERY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: OFFICE OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY

By: DAVID M. GENRICH

Assistant U.S. Attorney 600 United States Courthouse

300 South Fourth Street

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

For the Defendant: ENGH LAW OFFICE

By: PAUL C. ENGH, ESQUIRE

220 South Sixth Street - Suite 215

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

Court Reporter: TIMOTHY J. WILLETTE, RDR, CRR, CBC, CCP

Official Court Reporter - U.S.D.C.

1005 United States Courthouse

300 South Fourth Street

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

612.664.5108

appearances. I think we'll start at the plaintiff's table. Mr. Genrich? MR. GENRICH: Good morning, your Honor. David Genrich for the Government. At the table with me are Labor Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE COURT: Good morning, your Honor.			
THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated. THE CLERK: The case before the Court is United THE CLERK: The case before the Court is United States vs. Thomas James Martin, Criminal Case 02-127. THE COURT: Let's see. Let's begin by noting our appearances. I think we'll start at the plaintiff's table. Mr. Genrich? MR. GENRICH: Good morning, your Honor. David Genrich for the Government. At the table with me are Labor Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	2	PROCEEDINGS	
THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated. THE CLERK: The case before the Court is United States vs. Thomas James Martin, Criminal Case 02-127. THE COURT: Let's see. Let's begin by noting our appearances. I think we'll start at the plaintiff's table. Mr. Genrich? MR. GENRICH: Good morning, your Honor. David Genrich for the Government. At the table with me are Labor Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE COURT: Good morning, your Honor.	3	IN OPEN COURT	
THE CLERK: The case before the Court is United States vs. Thomas James Martin, Criminal Case 02-127. THE COURT: Let's see. Let's begin by noting our appearances. I think we'll start at the plaintiff's table. Mr. Genrich? MR. GENRICH: Good morning, your Honor. David Genrich for the Government. At the table with me are Labor Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	4	(Defendant present)	
THE COURT: Let's see. Let's begin by noting our appearances. I think we'll start at the plaintiff's table. Mr. Genrich? MR. GENRICH: Good morning, your Honor. David Genrich for the Government. At the table with me are Labor Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE COURT: Good morning, your Honor.	5	THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated.	
THE COURT: Let's see. Let's begin by noting our appearances. I think we'll start at the plaintiff's table. Mr. Genrich? MR. GENRICH: Good morning, your Honor. David Genrich for the Government. At the table with me are Labor Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	6	THE CLERK: The case before the Court is United	
appearances. I think we'll start at the plaintiff's table. Mr. Genrich? MR. GENRICH: Good morning, your Honor. David Genrich for the Government. At the table with me are Labor Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE COURT: Good morning, your Honor.	7	States vs. Thomas James Martin, Criminal Case 02-127.	
Mr. Genrich? MR. GENRICH: Good morning, your Honor. David Genrich for the Government. At the table with me are Labor Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	8	THE COURT: Let's see. Let's begin by noting our	
MR. GENRICH: Good morning, your Honor. David Genrich for the Government. At the table with me are Labor Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	9	appearances. I think we'll start at the plaintiff's table.	
Genrich for the Government. At the table with me are Labor Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	10	Mr. Genrich?	
Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	11	MR. GENRICH: Good morning, your Honor. David	
THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	12	Genrich for the Government. At the table with me are Labor	
Mr. Engh. MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	13	Investigators Guy Heidenreich and Sheldon Rinehart.	
MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin. He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	14	THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning.	
He's here today, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	15	Mr. Engh.	
THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	16	MR. ENGH: Paul Engh on behalf of Mr. Martin.	
THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	17	He's here today, your Honor. Thank you.	
	18	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin.	
THE COURT: It's been awhile since I've seen you.	19	THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.	
	20	THE COURT: It's been awhile since I've seen you.	
21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	21	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
THE COURT: The matter before us today, as we all	22	THE COURT: The matter before us today, as we all	
I know are well aware, is Mr. Martin's request that he be	23	I know are well aware, is Mr. Martin's request that he be	
allowed an exemption from the disqualification period to		allowed an exemption from the disqualification period to	
serve as a consultant or advisor to a labor organization.	24	arrowed an exemperon from one aroquarrireaction period to	

1 Let's see. And in terms of procedure or pattern, 2 I don't think there are enough of these motions -- this is 3 the first of mine -- to have an exact protocol, but I think 4 what -- I assume the defendant has the burden of proof on 5 this since the exemption is statutory. 6 So, I think, Mr. Engh, what I'll do is allow each 7 side about 15 minutes in whichever way you might want to 8 wish to proceed. I know Mr. Martin probably has something 9 he wants to say personally and you've got a bit of an 10 argument, so you can slice up your 15 minutes in whatever 11 way you think makes sense. 12 MR. ENGH: Okay. Well, what we'd like to do then 13 is have Mr. Martin make a statement. He's jotted his 14 thoughts down. 15 THE COURT: Sure. MR. ENGH: We have one exhibit, which are the 16 17 letters we submitted to the Department of Labor in 18 conjunction with our request, and then I'll follow up with a 19 short argument with the time allotted. 20 THE COURT: All right. I think that makes sense. 2.1 Mr. Martin, would you be more comfortable to be at 2.2 the lectern? Or if you'd rather sit on the witness stand, 23 either way is fine with me. 24 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I think I'd be more 25 comfortable at the lectern here.

```
1
                 THE COURT: That's fine.
 2
                 MR. ENGH: I should add these are Mr. Martin's
 3
       words. He's a bit nervous and so he's got an outline for
 4
       you.
 5
                 THE COURT: Not a problem.
                 MR. ENGH: If he has to read to get through it,
 6
 7
       he'll have to, but that's kind of what we're going to do.
 8
                 THE COURT: Whatever works for you. That's fine.
 9
                 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
10
                 THE COURT: And take your time. If you'd like to
11
       pour yourself a glass of water so that you're set, that
12
       would be fine too.
13
                 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor. I stand
14
       before you today not to plead an argument, but to show and
15
       to tell you about a changed man.
16
                 Your Honor, I'd like to thank you very much for
17
       seeing me today and taking the time. The last time I saw
18
       you I stood before you a broken man, never imagining the
19
       journey that I would be on. I vowed to myself I would never
20
       be in a courtroom again, but today here I am, not for any
2.1
       wrongdoing, but to request an opportunity for a future for
2.2
       me, a changed man.
23
                 Going to prison was a very -- was the darkest time
24
       in my life. I can remember like it was yesterday, riding up
25
       to Duluth, the snow was blowing, the sleet was coming down.
```

2.2

I thought my life was over. Thinking of the months ahead of me, there appeared to be no end in sight and there would be nothing left for me or of me when I finally got out.

Prison was a very humbling, gut-wrenching experience that took away my dignity, my pride, my freedom, and my choices. It isolated me from my family and my friends. Until that day I had never been afraid of anything, but then on that day I can remember I cried as we drove to prison.

I will never forget the looks on my father's, my wife's, or my children's faces, or the shame of having my grandchildren visiting me in prison. I had a lot of time to think about my life, how I had spun out of control, overtime, working 14 hours a day, destroying my first marriage, really taking no time to think. It became all-consuming, my job did, and I just let it happen over time.

Prison was a very and lonely dark time period for me, though as time went on it also gave me time to think about who I'd become and who I really wanted to be, what I needed versus what I wanted, where I had failed and who I had failed, and not only myself, but the people who loved and believed in me.

There is so much time in prison, so much downtime.

Downtime is something I never had much of before. Prison is

1 It forces you to look within and asking yourself 2 questions, tough questions about who and what you are, what 3 you've become and where you went wrong. 4 You keep it -- you get to a very low point, 5 disliking, even hating yourself. I had to dig deep. If I 6 had to -- I had a lot of time to think about my actions, 7 both good and bad, what changes I needed to make in my life 8 and accept what I had done, the people I had wronged and the 9 people's trust that I abused. I didn't like myself, so how 10 could others like me, let alone love me. 11 At a point I had to acknowledge and accept who and 12 what I had become, but that didn't mean I couldn't change. 13 I even began to welcome this time. I came to an inner peace 14 within me. I came to understand and respect the rule of 15 law, grateful of the little things that I never stopped to 16 think about previously and how precious my family and my 17 friends were. I came to realize how fast my life was 18 passing, yet never stopping to think about what was most 19 important. Excuse me. 20 THE COURT: Remind me -- I know the sentence was 2.1 24 months. How much did you end up actually serving? 2.2 THE DEFENDANT: Nineteen days, 10 months, your 23 Honor. THE COURT: Okay. 24 25 MR. ENGH: No, it was 19 months, ten days.

1 What did I say? THE DEFENDANT: 2 THE COURT: Nineteen months, 10 days. THE DEFENDANT: Oh, 19 months, 10 days. 3 THE COURT: Close to 20 months. 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: I came to realize how fast my life was passing, yet never stopping to think about what was 6 7 important, being true to yourself or your beliefs, being honest with myself or who I -- if I can't be honest with 8 9 myself, how can I be honest with others? 10 I prayed this would not kill my father, as he was 11 84 at the time and we were as close as father and son could 12 be. We were best friends. I was blessed with a loving wife 13 that came to see me every weekend and sometimes twice on one 14 weekend over the whole 19 months. She would bring my dad 15 when he was up to it and other unfailing friends that I can 16 never thank enough came to see me. The saying "You never know who your friends are" 17 18 I'm a very lucky person. I know my friends and is true. 19 what a precious gift they are. Most importantly, I wanted 20 and needed to prove to myself, my family and my friends and those that lost trust in me that I can do better, be better 2.1 2.2 than who I was. 23 Leaving prison gave me opportunities. You can't 24 imagine how you can appreciate the simplest things: 25 love of my wife, my father, my children, my grandchildren

```
1
       and my friends who came -- who cared so much about me.
 2
       was blessed to have three wonderful years with my father
 3
       before he passed away, but I can still see the
 4
       disappointment in my father's eyes. It haunts me to this
 5
       day.
 6
                 THE COURT: Your dad was a union man too, right?
 7
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 8
                 Before I stopped -- before -- my whole family is
 9
       union, your Honor.
10
                 THE COURT: Take your time. It's all right.
11
            (Pause)
12
                 THE DEFENDANT: Leaving prison gave me many
13
       opportunities. You can appreciate the simplest -- okay.
14
       did that.
15
                 But it still haunts me today, the look in my
16
       father's eyes, the disappointment in his voice.
                 Before I never stopped to think about what freedom
17
18
       really meant as it can be taken for granted so easily.
19
       look around my community, my city, my state, my country that
20
       I live in and I realize how blessed I am. Until you have
2.1
       everything stripped from you: your reputation, your
2.2
       finances, your privacy and your freedom, though done by my
23
       own doings, I had never really had much thought in it. I
24
       took it for granted. I was committed to my transition and
25
       my probation, working with my probation officer, Lester
```

2.2

Harris, following all the rules and three years of probation with no problems.

I started a business of my own as a home inspector, but as you know, the housing market is at record lows. I'm a very young 63-year-old man when it comes to attitude and energy, but as many others in the construction trade, my body shows the scars of working with the tools. Both my biceps have been ripped off the bones and surgically reattached. Unfortunately, one was not successful. With nerve damage in my arm, I do not have the range of motion and unable to hold many tools properly. I'm also in need of a complete right shoulder replacement.

Today I stand before you again, your Honor. I'm proud to say I'm a construction worker, a plumber, but most importantly a changed man, a better man than the one that stood before you six years ago. The only thing I know is the construction trades. My family, my friends, are all in the trades. It is something that is in my blood. I just can't let go. I feel I have so much that I can offer to the industry even though the market of high unemployment today is approaching 50 percent. I have ideas and a drive that I think I can make a difference.

I would like to have that chance to help put my members back to work so they can provide for their families.

I would also like to have a chance to go back to work and

2.1

2.2

redeem myself with the many people that once trusted me. I hope to prove that they can again.

I know I have done wrong, your Honor, and am truly sorry for what I have done. I believe I have served my time for what I have done. With the continued restrictions that have been imposed upon me, I am unable to pursue any type of career in the industry that I know and love other than working with the tools which I can no longer do.

I hope and pray the Court will see that I have served my time in prison, completed my probation and that I am truly sorry for what I have done and all of those I have hurt. I hope some day to be able to forgive myself, as I blame nobody but myself. The hard part is I have not been able to forgive myself. I know I can prove to the Court, the community, and the people that may no longer believe in me that they can again.

Your Honor, I know I have failed. I believe I paid for what I have done, confined in prison, serving my probation. I have reestablished myself in society, becoming a productive person. I believe I have done this to the best extent I can. I would like to be able to be that productive person, though, in the work that I love, the plumbing industry.

I'm asking your Honor to reconsider the restrictions that are upon me for 13 years, and in closing,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

I want to thank you for your consideration and time today, your Honor. If given the opportunity again to contribute to the industry I love, I promise you I will not let you down. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Martin. THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Engh? MR. ENGH: This is a unique case. When I started looking at the statute in response to some questions that Mr. Martin had, I saw that there was a possibility of some kind of redemption or a waiver of the 13 years, but there wasn't a lot of case law on it. There's not a lot of definition. The parties didn't find anything in the circuits to speak of. It looks like the statute was sort of an anti-mob statute passed a long time ago, but that really doesn't really matter to us. The words are the words in the

The question really today is whether he's been rehabilitated. It's the position of the Government, of course, that he hasn't been, and it's our position that he has been, and the vexing issue, I think, is that there's no standard to determine what rehabilitation is. This would lead us to the great intersection of psychiatry and law, that how can you tell someone has been changed, how can you tell someone's not going to do the same thing again, how can you tell a lesson has been learned, and it's not exactly

statute and that's how we interpret them.

```
1
       well defined. But we can, you know, establish some posits,
 2
       I think, as to how to deal with this.
 3
                 Number one, he is 63.
                 Number two, if you let the 13 years lapse, he's
 4
 5
       75. It would appear to be, in his family anyway, that the
       early eighties are the end of the line.
 6
 7
                 He cannot be a plumber again. What you're missing
 8
       here is to look at his arms where they had the surgery to
 9
       try to attach the tendons again, and it's almost shocking,
10
       really, what the life of plumbing can do to yourself.
11
       mean, it's -- and he was doing industrial, heavy plumbing.
12
       He wasn't fixing toilets. So it's not like he can be a
13
       plumber again.
14
                 THE COURT: I'm interested -- and I've forgotten.
15
       I'm sure it's back in the file, but how long were you
16
       actually a plumber before you became the business agent?
17
                 THE DEFENDANT: Fifteen years, your Honor.
18
                 THE COURT: How long were you doing the business
19
       agent part of it?
20
                 THE DEFENDANT: Nineteen years, your Honor.
2.1
                 THE COURT: So it's been a long time since you've
2.2
       actually done the labor part of it.
23
                 THE DEFENDANT: When released -- if I can, when I
24
       was released from prison, your Honor, I went back to work
25
       with the tools and I worked in the field.
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: Did you have some injury then, or is
 2
       the bicep problem and the arm problem from the years prior?
 3
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, from -- if you want to see
       them, I'll show you.
 4
 5
                 THE COURT: All right. I mean, I'm fine to look
 6
                 I have a husband that just had knee replacement
 7
       surgery, so I've been looking at lots of injuries and
 8
       surgeries lately.
 9
                 MR. ENGH: Tom, I think --
10
                 THE COURT: Can you roll up your sleeve so that I
11
       can see your arm?
12
                 THE DEFENDANT: One surgery was not successful.
13
       They had to take a nerve out of my right ankle and replace
14
       it to my left (indicating) arm.
15
                 THE COURT: Okay. Sorry to take a detour you
16
       didn't expect, Mr. Engh.
17
                 MR. ENGH: That's all right.
18
                 You know, the reason we asked for a hearing,
19
       though, is something near and dear to the defense bar, I
20
       think, and near and dear to Tom and his family, that there
2.1
       should be a mechanism in law for some kind of forgiveness
2.2
       after you've done your penance. This is rather a Judeo
23
       ethic -- a Christian --
24
                 THE COURT: I think I read something about that in
25
       the paper this morning in another context.
```

2.1

2.2

MR. ENGH: Okay. Well, I missed that article, but I'm sure I'll --

THE COURT: I'm talking about all of the arguments about Sara Jane Olson and the retribution and -- whole different case than this.

MR. ENGH: There is something to that. I mean -- and the reason I thought that we should have a hearing is that you should see him again after all these years, because I think if there is a fault in the system -- and it's certainly not your fault -- it's that we tend to forget about people, and what happens is that this was a tremendously important part of his life. And I didn't defend him six years ago, but I was representing witnesses back in that case and so ran into all the players and the parties and I did do his appeal to the Eighth Circuit, so we have known each other for a long time.

And the problem we're running into in law is that if you're a felon, you're really restricted forever. I mean, there's rent, it's hard to rent a place, it's hard to get unemployment, it's hard to get even insurance, and we've made it extremely difficult. He's very lucky because he has a union pension of sixty thousand a year and he's got a loving wife who's in the front row, but, you know, if he were someone who hadn't been protected by his colleagues and friends and hadn't had a union job, he'd almost be on the

street right now.

2.1

2.2

And what I think what he wants, I know he wants, is some kind of redemption for his past misconduct. And he is very much his father's son. So, you know, if you track his life, it is true. He's got his failed marriage, his new marriage.

And then the other thing he always talks about besides his lovely wife is his father. It comes up in almost every conversation I've ever had with him, unasked. And so he feels as if he shamed his dad and shamed his union and he'd like to somehow remedy that. And you can say that's psychological hooey, but it really is, you know, the root of his life, frankly, and it was in his union blood. He can't take a nonunion job for a nonunion contractor, because if he did that, he'd waive his pension.

And he's not in a position where he can work and what he would like to do is either have the option of working in union management again -- he's not there, he can't even get elected, he doesn't have permission to run, he can't really be active in the union -- or he would like to work with a contractor who employees union individuals in facilitating the work. Granted, the construction trades are minimal, we know that, but sooner or later it will rebound, we hope, and he'd like a second chance.

And it seems -- I mean, I just think the law

```
1
       should be about second chances. I really believe that.
 2
       if we're not about that, then we have thousands of littered
 3
       bodies all over the place that have destroyed themselves at
 4
       42 or 19 or 20. And he was by all our standards older when
 5
       he came to court on that major case that you had, and
 6
       so that's -- he'd like another opportunity. If we don't
 7
       give it to him now, it just doesn't pay to wait.
 8
       Logistically, he can't do it.
 9
                 But I'd also -- there's kind of an in-between
10
       position that you can take. You know, it's not an
11
       all-or-nothing situation. I mean, I think you could
12
       reinstate him or give him permission to work with abundant
       conditions: You will do this, this and this in care of the
13
14
       Department of Labor. We will ask you to comply with this
15
       condition, that condition, this condition, that condition.
16
       You know, there's a middle ground here that you can take.
17
                 The only exhibit we have is Exhibit 1, which I'll
18
       give to your clerk. Those are the letters that he submitted
19
       with his petition. We'd like you to review those.
20
                 THE COURT: All right.
2.1
                 MR. ENGH: I don't think they're in the court
2.2
       file. I know I didn't scan them and put them in ECF because
23
       some of the content is very personal.
                 THE COURT: Okay.
24
25
                 MR. ENGH: And I don't believe the Government has
```

```
1
       any objection.
 2
                 MR. GENRICH: No, your Honor.
 3
                 THE COURT: All right. We'll receive that then,
       and, Katie, you can mark that Defense Exhibit 1 if it isn't
 4
 5
       already.
            (Defense Exhibit 1 received in evidence)
 6
 7
                 THE COURT: Mr. Genrich.
 8
                 MR. GENRICH: Well, thank you, your Honor.
 9
                 As the Court knows, I was not the counsel for the
10
       Government with respect to either Mr. Biernat's matter or
11
       Mr. Martin's matter and have come onto this even later than
12
       Mr. Engh, but the Government does have a position. And as
13
       Mr. Engh indicated, there's sort of a paucity of authority
14
       in these sorts of motions and it gives both Mr. Engh and the
15
       Government somewhat of a free hand to shape their argument
16
       based on what they think are the most important
       considerations.
17
18
                 I do want to preface the Government's argument by
19
       saying the Government doesn't seek to define Mr. Martin's
20
       life by his criminal conviction. The Government doesn't
2.1
       seek to make character attacks on Mr. Martin, to comment on
2.2
       his close personal and family relationships, or undermine
23
       any of the important personal considerations referenced both
24
       by Mr. Martin and by Mr. Engh.
25
                 But the Government believes this motion is not
```

2.1

2.2

about a couple of other things. It's not about whether

Mr. Martin can be employed in any capacity, either outside

the union construction trade context or even within it.

Mr. Martin is not barred from being a union member, he's not

barred from accepting jobs related to union membership, and

he's not barred from being a plumber, from owning a plumbing

business, from working in some other capacity.

THE COURT: Are there positions that he could hold that would not involve physical labor that would not violate the 504 disqualification?

MR. GENRICH: Well, the statute defines the excluded categories. It's the Government's position and belief that should he work for a management organization that deals with labor relations issues -- and I think this Metro PHCC is an organization that deals quite closely with union contracting and labor management relations -- or in a union position, that the 504 exclusion would apply.

And as the Court knows and the Government's position, part of the Government's concern -- and I appreciate Mr. Engh addressing this -- is that there isn't really any specificity in Defendant's request. It's still unclear to the Government what position or positions it is Mr. Martin would seek and what responsibilities those positions would include.

THE COURT: But he's kind of barred at this point

2.1

2.2

from finding out much about that, is he not? I mean, the statutory prohibition doesn't let him run for office and see if he's elected, for example.

MR. GENRICH: No, but the statutory prohibition would not prevent him making a motion with specificity to the Court indicating that he has explored X, Y or Z positions either within or without the union in a management position. There have been some steps toward that. He indicated to the Labor Department that he wanted to work for Metro PHCC I think is the abbreviation, and the person involved with that organization was interviewed by Labor and provided a summary in the affidavit.

But the Government's not aware and with respect to Defendant it's not the Government's burden to explore what position it is that he seeks and what the responsibilities would be. The Government doesn't believe he's prevented in any way from saying to the Court, for example, "I'd like to run for union office. I'm not going to run for union treasurer," which would be a position very close to the management of money and implicate in the Government's mind the prior convictions, "but I do want to run as union steward, and here, your Honor, is what the position of union steward involves." The Government's not in a position to evaluate a request like that because no request has been made.

2.2

So, you know, I respectfully submit that the
Government believes both the Court and the Government is at
somewhat of a disadvantage to the extent the request here
is: "I don't want to be excluded from working in a
management-related position," and Mr. Martin is not at
liberty to go find a position that includes undefined
responsibilities. And that's why, although the Government
opposes this motion, the Government does believe that should
the Court grant the motion, Mr. Engh should be taken up on
the suggestion that first Mr. Martin identify to the Court
what position or positions it is he's seeking so the Court
can evaluate the appropriateness of those positions.

And secondly, that this be an exclusion and not a reduction, meaning that the Court retains the ability to supervise, even if from a distance, what sort of employment activity Mr. Martin is engaged in and the Department of Labor is given an opportunity to supervise in some sense what it is Mr. Martin is doing.

So the motion is not fundamentally about whether Mr. Martin works. It's about what type of position Mr. Martin works in.

The Government's not in any position to dispute his injuries. I would note that the Department of Labor interviewed the employer for whom Mr. Martin did plumbing work after he was released from prison. The employer

2.2

indicated that Mr. Martin stopped doing that work in part because the market was slow and there wasn't enough work to go around. But I'm in no position, you know, to dispute the injury factor, but there is a record here that Mr. Martin would be gainfully employed in the industry short of assuming positions that in the Government's mind aren't appropriate given the nature of the convictions.

THE COURT: Can you be specific about what those positions would be, ways that he could be gainfully employed in the industry without violating the --

MR. GENRICH: He can be a union member. He can do plumbing work, whatever the limitations are physically. He's not barred from the exclusion from being a plumber. He would not be barred, for example, from running a plumbing business, from employing other plumbers, from being the person who does the bidding, soliciting the contracts, et cetera, but operating a plumbing enterprise without doing whatever work there may be physical limitations preventing him from doing. You know, whether he could take a nonunion job or not is something that the Labor investigators are not clear about, but clearly he could work as a union plumber and he could employ union plumbers to work on behalf of a company that he established.

So, he can work in the industry. What the Government is seeking is the exclusion remain in place with

2.1

2.2

respect to consulting management and labor management positions or taking a union leadership position.

And again, while I think Mr. Engh and the Court is correct that there aren't enough of these motions to really flesh out a set standard, it's clear other courts have looked at the nature of the offense, the nature of the position sought and steps taken toward a clear demonstration of rehabilitation.

And I know the Court -- I'm sure the Court has in mind the nature of the offense here. I must admit that once I reviewed the presentence report, it provided additional detail that's not revealed, for example, in the Eighth Circuit opinion about the pattern of conduct in this case. And it's not true that Mr. Martin only compromised the market recovery fund with respect to the Biernat matter. He also compromised the fund with respect to four or five friends and family members. And the Court also applied an obstruction enhancement based on his conduct during the investigation.

I understand the defense view that that's water under the bridge and Mr. Martin's a changed main, but in determining whether it's appropriate for Mr. Martin to assume a position within a union or within a management organization when he's been convicted of very serious crimes that go not to offenses under the statute that don't relate

2.1

2.2

to union matters -- sexual assault was the example cited in one case -- but go to the very heart of what it means to be trusted with union funds that were collected from the dues of union members, is something that the Court believes the -- the Government believes the Court should strongly consider in deciding whether a return to a management or consultant-type position is appropriate, the signal it would send to both labor and management. And the purposes behind the statute which may have arisen out of organized crime, but particularly when the exclusion was extended several decades later from five to 13 years, were meant to protect the integrity of unions and management, and appearances matter.

And it's one of the points emphasized by those who are opposed to reinstatement of Mr. Martin in the affidavit that the nature of these offenses, that the compromise of union funds supported by union dues are matters that are so important, that the return of Mr. Martin to a position of authority within a union or management would send a very negative signal about the integrity of unions and the public policy behind the Labor Management Relations Act.

You know, I'll just close, your Honor, unless the Court has additional questions, with the rehabilitation notion.

I share again Mr. Engh's threshold comments that

2.1

2.2

the standard is ill-defined, that rehabilitation doesn't have a set meaning and there aren't factors defined in the statute. But having said that, Mr. Martin, again, without in any way impugning his character, hasn't demonstrated four years out the sort of clear demonstration of rehabilitation that would support reinstatement given the nature of the offense, the nature of the positions sought, and the interviews summarized by Labor, including the interviews of those who support his reinstatement, given the fundamental gaps in many of those individuals' understandings about what it is that brought Mr. Martin before the Court in the first instance.

The Government understands that Mr. Martin's -- in

The Government understands that Mr. Martin's -- in some narrow sense in the Government's view his future livelihood is at stake with respect to the type of position he can assume, but the nature of the convictions, the ill-defined nature of the positions sought and the precedent from the other cases, your Honor, really leave the Government in a position where it strongly states its opposition to exemption under these circumstances and does believe that the remaining nine of the original 13-year bar should remain in place at this point.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. GENRICH: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Engh, as the maker of the motion,

1 I'll give you the final word. 2 MR. ENGH: I appreciate my colleague's comments. 3 You know, it's one thing to say you haven't been 4 rehabilitated. It's quite another thing to say how you do 5 it. And so I'm mystified as to what he needs to show to show that he's been rehabilitated. And so it's an argument 6 7 that, you know, has some emotional weight, but it's rather 8 vacuous, because there's no standard behind it. You just 9 haven't met the standard. We don't know what it is, but you 10 won't ever meet it. 11 And in terms of we don't know what he's going to 12 do in terms of jobs or running for office, perhaps that's my 13 fault. He came to see me. I told him he couldn't run for 14 office because that would be meddling in the union's 15 business and there would be no point in running for any 16 office, because once he got elected he'd be kicked out, and 17 if he did run, I thought he would be in violation of your 18 So, to say we don't know what job he's going to run 19 for is another cart before the horse. I mean, it's a nice 20 argument, but it's utterly --21 THE COURT: But that is what you seek is for him 2.2 to run for an elective office. 23 MR. ENGH: Right. And, you know, they can reject 24 You know, I appreciate the Government's concerns.

appreciate the PSI. It's been six years. And if the

25

1 membership wants to reject him, they can reject him, and if 2 he gets elected, you can put unbelievable restrictions on 3 him: no money, no checks, no fund --4 THE COURT: How would I supervise that, though? Ι 5 mean, he's off supervision. I certainly don't want to 6 revisit supervision again. 7 MR. ENGH: He's on supervision with the Department 8 of Labor. They would supervise him, report to the Court on 9 the conditions. It's still a court order he has to do that. 10 It's also a Department of Labor order that they imposed as 11 well at the same time your sentence came down. He received 12 the same conditions that you gave him. 13 So, I mean, we should be in the position of giving 14 people a second chance, I really believe that, especially 15 when there's no articulation as to what he has to do other 16 than to say he hasn't done it. THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm not going to 17 18 rule from the bench today. I'm going to take a more careful 19 look at the exhibits produced and the law. I looked at this 20 a few weeks ago and I think at the time I scheduled the 2.1 hearing and I want to review that, but there are a couple 2.2 things I would like to say today. 23 One of those is that I agree with Mr. Engh and I think Mr. Genrich and the Government does too. There should 24 25 be second chances. I have no doubt about that. I think

2.1

2.2

I've provided them in some situations where appropriate from time to time and within my ability to do so.

I did take -- "offense" is too strong a word. I was a little bothered, Mr. Engh. You did make some reference to we never in federal court ever see people after they're sentenced, and that isn't true. I mean, I have made efforts through the years to contact various defendants I've sentenced. And so there is some process, not a good one and I agree with you that there should be a more ideally procedural way for a judge to evaluate the effect of our sentences on people.

The other thing that I disagree with Mr. Engh on a tad is that I don't think the case really in front of me is about rehabilitation in the sense that are you a changed person. I'm convinced you are and my decision isn't going to be about whether I think you've learned something from the process of being incarcerated or that I don't think it had any effect on you. I think it had a strong effect on you and I accept and believe you when you say you're a changed man and that you appreciate things in life, small pleasures, love of family, things that never occurred to you before and that we all tend to take for granted, but after a period of incarceration I know the world you see through very different eyes than you did prior to your incarceration.

1 So I don't think whatever I end up ruling means 2 that I don't think Mr. Martin has not been rehabilitated. 3 think he's been significantly rehabilitated. The issue 4 that's posed to me is, is this statutory exemption and 5 disqualification, should it be applied in this situation, 6 and I look at it from a narrow legal perspective. I agree 7 with counsel there's not a whole lot of quidance for me out 8 there in how to apply the law, but I will take a careful 9 look at it and get you an order as soon as I can. 10 Thanks for coming in. 11 MR. GENRICH: Your Honor? 12 THE COURT: Yes? 13 MR. GENRICH: Could I just be heard on two quick 14 factual things without argument? 15 THE COURT: Sure. 16 MR. GENRICH: One is, the Labor investigators tell 17 me that Mr. Martin could be appointed to a union position if 18 there was a vacancy before some election period, so it's not 19 necessarily true that the union members would be the 20 threshold or the only voice in whether he would ascend to a 2.1 union position. 2.2 And second, I didn't want there to be a 23 misunderstanding. The Government's position isn't that Mr. Martin should have run for union office and then 24 25 approached the Court. The Government's position is that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

```
whether Mr. Martin ran for, for example, union treasurer and
said, "You know, I've got control over millions of dollars
of funds" or some other position, the Government may still
oppose the other position, but some other position that
doesn't involve control over funds, for example, which
relates to the offenses should be a material consideration
in whether the exemption is lifted for purposes of that
position. I agree with Mr. Engh's position --
          THE COURT: Kind of a cart-and-horse situation,
though. I mean, at what point --
         MR. GENRICH: Well, the Government's concern would
be if the exemption's lifted without definition, that
Mr. Martin could ascend to a position where the statutory
bar speaks more strongly than some position that doesn't
involve, for example, the management of funds. That's the
Government's point. Not that he should have run for office
beforehand, but that there should be a definition of what he
wants to do for the union so we can measure the statutory
prohibition against the requested exemption.
          THE COURT: All right. I understand.
          Did you wish to respond to that, Mr. Engh, or --
         MR. ENGH: He has no intention of handling any
union funds or being a union treasurer or having anything to
do with the books and records.
          THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
```

1	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.
2	(Proceedings concluded at 11:36 a.m.)
3	* * * *
4	
5	
6	
7	CERTIFICATE
8	
9	I, TIMOTHY J. WILLETTE, Official Court Reporter
10	for the United States District Court, do hereby
11	certify that the foregoing pages are a true and
12	accurate transcription of my shorthand notes,
13	taken in the aforementioned matter, to the best
14	of my skill and ability.
15	or my skill and ability.
16	
17	
18	/s/ Timothy J. Willette
19	
20	TIMOTHY J. WILLETTE, RDR, CRR, CBC, CCP Official Court Reporter - U.S. District Court
21	1005 United States Courthouse 300 South Fourth Street
22	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415-2247 612.664.5108
23	
24	
25	
))	